

THE WESTERN DEMOCRAT.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

A FAMILY PAPER—DEVOTED TO POLITICS, LITERATURE, AGRICULTURE, MANUFACTURES, MINING, AND NEWS.

PRICE \$2 PER YEAR—In Advance.

ROBERT P. WARING, Editor.

"The States—Distinct as the Willow, but one as the Sea."

RUFUS M. HERRON, Publisher.

VOL. 2.

CHARLOTTE, N. C., FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 19, 1854.

NO. 43.

Business Cards, &c.

R. P. WARING,
Attorney at Law,
Office in Loring's Brick Building, 2nd floor.
CHARLOTTE, N. C.

RHETT & ROBSON,
FACTORS & COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
Nos. 1 and 2 Atlantic Wharf,
CHARLOTTE, S. C.
Special advances made on Consignments.
Special attention given to the sale of Flour, Corn,
&c. and from a long experience in the business, we
feel confident of giving satisfaction.
March 17, 1854. 34-6m

Dry Goods in Charleston, So. Ca.
BROWNING & LEMAN,
IMPORTERS OF DRY GOODS,
Nos. 209 and 211 King street, corner of Market Street.
CHARLOTTE, S. C.
Plantation Woolsens, Blankets, &c., Carpetings and
Curtain Materials, Silks and Rich Dress Goods, Cloaks,
Mantillas and Shawls. Terms Cash. One Price Only.
March 17, 1854. 34-1y

RANKIN, PULLIAM & CO.,
Importers and Wholesale Dealers in
FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC STAPLE AND FANCY
DRY GOODS AND CLOTHING,
No. 131 MEETING STREET,
Sept 23, '53 1y CHARLOTTE, S. C.

H. H. WILLIAMS & CO.,
Manufacturers and Dealers in
PANAMA, LEIGHORN, FUR, SILK & WOOL
HATS,
OPPOSITE CHARLESTON HOTEL,
Sept 23, '53 1y CHARLOTTE, S. C.

N. A. COHEN & COHN,
Importers and Dealers in
FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC DRY GOODS,
No. 175 EAST BAY,
(10-1y) CHARLOTTE, S. C.

WARDLAW, WALKER & BURNSIDE,
COTTON FACTORS
AND COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
NORTH ATLANTIC WHARF,
CHARLOTTE, S. C.
Commission for selling Cotton Fifty cents per Bale.
Sept 22, 1853. 10-1y

RAMSEY'S PIANO STORE.
MUSIC AND MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.
NUNNS & CO.'S Patent
Diagonal Grand PIANOS—
Hallett Davis & Co.'s Patent
Suspension Bridge PIANOS;
Chickering's, Travers's and
other best makers' Pianos, at
the Factory Prices.
Columbia, S. C., Sept. 23, 1852. 10-1y.

S. J. LOWRIE,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
WILL practice in Mecklenburg and the adjoining
counties and preside at County Land and Pension
boards. Office in Johnston's brick building, between
Berry's Hotel and the Post Office, upstairs.
March 18, 1855. 35-1y

CAROLINA INN,
BY JENNINGS B. KERR,
Charlotte, N. C.
January 28, 1853. 28-1y

Mrs. A. W. WHELAN,
SEWING AND DRESS MAKER.
(Residence, on Main Street, 3 doors south of Sadler's
Hotel.)
CHARLOTTE, N. C.
Dresses cut and made by the celebrated A. B. C.
method, and warranted to fit. Orders solicited and
promptly attended to. Sept. 9, 1853—8-1y.

BAILIE & LAMBERT,
219 KING STREET,
CHARLOTTE, S. C.
IMPORTERS & DEALERS in Royal Velvet, Tapestry,
Brussels, Three ply, Ingrain and Venetian
CARPETINGS; India, Rush and Spanish MATTINGS,
Rugs, Door Mats, &c. &c.
FINE CLOTHS, of all widths, cut for rooms or entries.
IRISH LINENS, SHIRTINGS, DAMASKS, Diapers,
Long Lawns, Towels, Napkins, Doylies, &c.
An extensive assortment of Window CURTAINS,
CORNICIENS, &c. &c.
Manufacturers will do well to examine our stock
before purchasing elsewhere.
Sept. 22, 1853. 10-1y

The American Hotel,
CHARLOTTE, N. C.
I beg to announce to my friends, the public, and pres-
ent patrons of the above Hotel, that I have leased the
same for a term of years from the 1st of January next.
After which time, the entire property will be thoroughly
repaired and renovated, and the house kept in first
class style. This Hotel is near the Depot, and pleasant
situated, rendering it a desirable house for travelers
and families.
Dec 16, 1853. 22-1 C. M. RAY.

Baltimore Piano Forte Manufactory.
J. WISE & BROTHER, Manufacturers of Boudoir
J. Grand and Square PIANOS. Those wishing a
good and substantial Piano that will last an age, at a
fair price, may rely on getting such by addressing the
Manufacturers, by mail or otherwise. We have the
honor of serving and referring to the first families in the
State. In no case is disappointment sufferable. The
Manufacturers, also, refer to a host of their fellow citi-
zens.
J. WISE & BROTHER,
Feb 3, 1854 25-4m Baltimore, Md.

MARCH & SHARP,
AUCTIONEERS AND COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
COLUMBIA, S. C.
WILL attend to the sale of all kinds of Merchandise,
Produce, &c. Also, Real and Personal Property.
Or purchase and sell Slaves, &c., on Commission.
Sales Room—No. 12) Richardson Street, and immedi-
ately opposite the United States Hotel.
Feb 3, 1854 ZHOS. H. MARCH. J. M. E. SHARP.

Livery and Sales Stable,
BY S. H. REA.
At the stand formerly occupied by R. Morrison, in
Charlotte, horses fed, hired and sold. Good ac-
commodations for Drivers. The custom of his friends
and the public generally solicited.
February 17, 1854. 30-y

Veto Message.

Message from the President of the United States,
Returning to the Senate the bill entitled "An act mak-
ing a grant of public lands to the several States for
the benefit of indigent insane persons," with a state-
ment of the objections which have required him to
withhold from it his approval.

To the Senate of the United States:

The bill, entitled "An act making a grant of
public lands to the several States for the benefit of
indigent insane persons," which was presented to
me on the 27th ultimo, has been maturely consid-
ered, and is returned to the Senate, the house in
which it originated, with a statement of objections
which have required me to withhold from it my
approval.

In the performance of this duty, prescribed by the
Constitution, I have been compelled to resist the
deep sympathies of my heart in favor of the hu-
mane purpose sought to be accomplished, and to
overcome the reluctance with which I dissent from
the conclusions of the two houses of Congress, and
present my own opinions in opposition to the
action of a co-ordinate branch of the government
which possesses so fully my confidence and respect.

If, in presenting my objections to this bill, I
should say more than strictly belongs to the meas-
ure, or is required for the discharge of my official
obligation, let it be attributed to a sincere desire
to justify my act before those whose good opinion
I so highly value, and to that earnestness which
springs from my deliberate conviction that a strict
adherence to the terms and purposes of the federal
compact offers the best, if not the only, security
for the preservation of our blessed inheritance
of representative liberty.

The bill provides, in substance:
That ten millions of acres of land be
granted to the several States, to be apportioned
among them in the compound ratio of the geograph-
ical area, and representation of said States in the
House of Representatives.

Second, That wherever there are public lands
in a State subject to sale at the regular price of
private entry, the proportion of said ten millions
of acres falling to such State shall be selected from
such public lands, land scrip shall be issued to
the amount of their distributive shares, respective-
ly; said scrip not to be entered by said States, but
to be sold by them, and subject to entry by their
assignees, provided that none of it shall be sold at
less than one dollar per acre, under penalty of
forfeiture of the same to the United States.

Third, That the expenses of the management
and superintendence of said lands, and of the mon-
eys received therefrom, shall be paid by the States
to which they may belong, out of the treasury of
said States.

Fourth, That the gross proceeds of the sales of
such lands, or land-scrip so granted, shall be in-
vested by the several States in safe stocks, to con-
stitute a perpetual fund, the principal of which
shall remain forever undiminished, and the interest
to be appropriated to the maintenance of the
indigent insane within the several States.

Fifth, That annual returns of lands or scrip
sold shall be made by the States to the Secretary
of the Interior, and the whole grant be subject
to certain conditions and limitations prescribed in
the bill, to be assented to by legislative acts of said
States.

This bill, therefore, proposes that the federal
government shall make provision to the amount of
the value of ten millions of acres of land, for an
elementary object within the several States, to be
administered by the political authority of the
same; and it presents, at the threshold, the ques-
tion, whether any such act on the part of the federal
government, is warranted and sanctioned by the
constitution, the provisions and principles of which
are to be protected and sustained as a first and
paramount duty.

It cannot be questioned that if Congress have
power to make provision for the indigent insane
without the limits of this District, it has the same
power to provide for the indigent who are not in-
sane, and thus to transfer to the federal government
the charge of all the poor in all the States. It has
the same power to provide hospitals and other local
establishments for the care and cure of every
species of human infirmity, and thus to assume all
that duty of either public philanthropy, or public
necessity, to the dependent, the orphan, the sick,
or the needy, which is now discharged by the
States themselves, or by corporate institutions, or
private endowments existing under the legislation
of the States. The whole field of public benefi-
cence is thrown open to the care and culture of
the federal government. Generous impulses no
longer encounter the limitations and control of our
imperious fundamental law; for, however worthy
may be the present object in itself, it is only one of
a class. It is not exclusively worthy of benevo-
lent regard. Whatever considerations dictate
sympathy for this particular object, apply, in like
manner, if not in the same degree, to idiocy, to
physical disease, to extreme destitution. If Con-
gress may and ought to provide for any one of
these objects, it may and ought to provide for them
all. And if it be done in this case, what answer
shall be given when Congress shall be called upon,
as it doubtless will be, to pursue a similar course
of legislation in the others? It will, obviously,
be vain to reply that the object is worthy, but that
the application has taken a wrong direction.

The power will have been deliberately, assumed,
the general obligation will, by this act, have
been acknowledged, and the question of means and
expediency will alone be left for consideration.—
The decision upon the principle, in any one case,
determines it for the whole class. The question
presented, therefore, clearly is upon the constitu-
tionality and propriety of the federal government
assuming to enter into a novel and vast field
of legislation—namely, that of providing for the care
and support of all those, among the people of the
United States who, by any form of calamity, be-
come fit objects of public philanthropy.

I readily, and I trust, feelingly, acknowledge
the duty incumbent on us all, as men and citizens,
and as among the highest and holiest of our duties,
to provide for those who, in the mysterious order
of Providence, are subject to want and to disease
of body or mind; but I cannot find any authority
in the constitution for making the federal govern-
ment the great almoner of public charity through-
out the United States. To do so would, in my
judgment, be contrary to the letter and spirit of the
constitution, and subversive of the whole theory
upon which the union of these States is founded.

And if it were admissible to contemplate the ex-
ercise of this power for any object whatever, I can-
not avoid the belief that it would, in the end, be
prejudicial, rather than beneficial, to the noble ob-
jects of charity to have the charge of them trans-
ferred from the States to the federal government.
Are we not too prone to forget that the federal
Union is the creature of the States, not they of the
federal Union? We were the inhabitants of colonies
distinct in local government one from the other
before the revolution. By that revolution the colonies
each became an independent State. They achieved
that independence, and secured its recognition
by the agency of a consulting body, which from
being an assembly of the ministers of distinct sov-
ereignities, instructed to agree to no form of govern-
ment which did not leave the domestic concerns
of each State to itself, was appropriately denomi-
nated a Congress. When having tried the experi-
ment of the confederation, they resolved to
change that for the present federal Union; and
thus to confer on the federal government more am-
ple authority, they scrupulously measured such of
the functions of their cherished sovereignty as they
chose to delegate to the general government.—
With this aim, and to this end, the fathers of the
republic framed the constitution, in and by which
the independent and sovereign States united them-
selves, for certain specified objects and purposes,
and for those only, leaving all powers not therein
set forth as conferred on one or another of the
three great departments, the legislative, the execu-
tive, and the judicial, indubitably with the States.
And when the people of the several States had, in
their State conventions, and thus alone, given effect
and force to the constitution, not content that any
doubt should in future arise as to the scope and
character of this act, they ingrained thereon the ex-
plicit declaration that—"The powers not delegat-
ed to the United States by the constitution, nor pro-
hibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States
respectively, or to the people."

Can it be controverted that the great mass of the
business of government that involved, in the social
relations, the internal arrangements of the body
politic; the mental and moral culture of men; the
development of local resources of wealth; the pun-
ishment of crimes in general; the preservation of
order; the relief of the needy, or otherwise unfor-
tunate members of society, did, in practice, remain
with the States; that none of these objects of local
concern are, by the constitution, expressly or im-
pliedly prohibited to the States, and that none of
them are, by any express language of the constitu-
tion, transferred to the United States? Can it be
claimed that any of these functions of local admin-
istration and legislation are vested in the federal
government by any implication? I have never
found anything in the constitution which is sus-
ceptible of such a construction. No one of the
enumerated powers touches the subject, or has even
a remote analogy to it. The powers conferred
upon the United States have reference to federal
relations or to the means of accomplishing or ex-
ecuting things of federal relation. So, also, of the
same character are the powers taken away from
the States by enumeration. In either case, the
powers granted and the powers restricted were so
granted or so restricted only where it was requisite
for the maintenance of peace and harmony between
the States, or for the purpose of protecting their
common interests, and defending their common
sovereignty, against aggression from abroad or in-
surrection at home.

I shall not discuss the question of power some-
times claimed for the general government, under
the clause of the eighth section of the constitution,
which gives Congress the power "to lay and col-
lect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay
debts, and provide for the common defence and
general welfare of the United States," because if
it has not already been settled upon sound reason
and authority, it never will be. I take the received
and just construction of that article, as if written
to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and ex-
cises, in order to pay the debts, and in order to
provide for the common defence and general wel-
fare. It is not a substantive general power to
provide for the welfare of the United States, but is
a limitation on the grant of power to raise money
by taxes, duties, and imposts. If it were other-
wise, all the rest of the constitution, consisting
of carefully enumerated and cautiously guarded
grants of specific powers, would have been useless,
if not delusive. It would be impossible, in that
view, to escape from the conclusion that these were
inserted only to mislead for the present, and, in-
stead of enlightening and defining the pathway of
the future, to involve its action in the mazes of
doubtful construction. Such a conclusion the
character of the men who framed that sacred instru-
ment will never permit us to form. Indeed, to sup-
pose it susceptible of any other construction would
be to consign all the rights of the States, and of
the people of the States, to the mere discretion of
Congress, and thus to clothe the federal govern-
ment with authority to control the sovereign States,
by which the States would have been dwarfed into
provinces or departments, and all sovereignty ves-
ted in an absolute consolidated central power,
against which the spirit of liberty has so often, and
in so many countries, struggled in vain. In my
judgment, you cannot, by tributes to humanity,
make any adequate compensation for the wrong
you would inflict by removing the sources of power
and political action from those who are to be there-
by affected. If the time shall ever arrive when,
for an object appealing however strongly to our
sympathies, the dignity of the States shall bow to
the dictation of Congress, by conforming their
legislation thereto, when the power, and majesty,
and honor of those who created shall become sub-
ordinate to the thing of their creation, I but feebly
utter my apprehensions when I express my firm
conviction that we shall see "the beginning of the
end."

Fortunately, we are not left in doubt as to the
purpose of the constitution any more than as to its
formation, as recorded in the Madison Papers,
shows that the federal government, in its present
form emerged from the conflict of opposing influ-
ences, which have continued to divide statesmen
from that day to this, yet the rule of clearly de-
fined powers; and of strict construction, pre-
sided over the actual conclusion and subsequent adoption
of the constitution.

President Madison, in the *Federalist*, says: "The
powers delegated by the proposed constitution to
the federal government are few and defined.
Those which are to remain in the State govern-

ments are numerous and indefinite. "Its" (the
general government's) "jurisdiction extends to cer-
tain enumerated objects only, and leaves to the
several States a residuary and inviolable sov-
ereignty over all other objects."

In the same spirit, President Jefferson invokes
"the support of the State governments in all their
rights as the most competent administrations for
our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwark
against anti-republican tendencies;" and President
Jackson said that our true strength and wisdom
are not promoted by invasions of the rights and
powers of the several States, but that, on the con-
trary, they consist "not in binding the States more
closely to the centre, but in leaving each more un-
obscured in its proper orbit."

The framers of the constitution, in refusing to
confer on the federal government any jurisdiction
over these purely local objects, in my judgment
manifested a wise forecast and broad comprehen-
sion of the true interests of these objects them-
selves. It is clear that public charities within the
States can be efficiently administered only by their
authority. The bill before me concedes this, for
it does not commit the funds it provides to the ad-
ministration of any other authority.

I cannot but repeat what I have before ex-
pressed, that if the several States, many of which
have already laid the foundation of magnificent es-
tablishments of local beneficence, and nearly all
of which are proceeding to establish them, shall
be led to suppose, as they will be should this bill
become a law, that Congress is to make provision
for such objects, the fountains of charity will be
dried up at home, and the several States, instead
of bestowing their own means on the social wants
of their own people, may themselves, through the
strong temptation, which appeals to States as to
individuals, become humble suppliants for the
bounty of the federal government, reversing their
true relation to this Union.

Having stated my views of the limitation of the
powers conferred by the eighth section of the first
article of the constitution, I deem it proper to call
attention to the third section of the fourth article,
and to the provisions of the sixth article, bearing
directly upon the question under consideration;
which, instead of aiding the claim to power exer-
cised in this case, tend, it is believed, strongly to
illustrate and explain positions which, even without
such support, I cannot regard as questionable.

The third section of the fourth article of the con-
stitution is in the following terms: "The Congress
shall have power to dispose of and make all need-
ful rules and regulations respecting the territory
or other property belonging to the United States;
and nothing in this constitution shall be so con-
strued as to prejudice any claim of the United
States, or any particular State." The sixth article
is as follows, to wit, that "All debts contracted and
engagements entered into, before the adoption of
this constitution, shall be as valid against the United
States under this constitution as under the confed-
eration."

For a correct understanding of the terms used in
the third section of the fourth article, above
quoted, reference should be had to the history of
the times in which the constitution was formed and
adopted. It was decided upon in Convention, on the
17th September, 1787, and by it Congress was
empowered to "dispose of," &c., "the territory or
other property belonging to the United States."

The only territory then belonging to the United
States was that then recently ceded by the several
States, to wit: by New York in 1781; by Virginia
in 1784; by Massachusetts in 1785; and by South
Carolina in August, 1787, the month before the
formation of the constitution. The cession from
Virginia contained the following provision:

"That all the lands within the territory so ceded
to the United States, and not reserved for or ap-
propriated to any of the before-mentioned purposes,
or disposed of in bounty to the officers and soldiers
of the American army, shall be considered a com-
mon fund for the use and benefit of such of the
United States as have become or shall become
members of the confederation or federal alliance
of the said States, Virginia included, according to
their usual respective propositions, in the general
charter and expenditure, and shall be faithfully and
bona fide disposed of for that purpose, and for no
other use or purpose whatsoever."

Here the object for which these lands are to be
disposed of is clearly set forth, and the power to
dispose of them, granted by the third section of
the fourth article of the constitution, clearly con-
templates such disposition only. If such be the
fact, and in my mind there can be no doubt of it,
then you have again not only no implication in
favor of the contemplated grant, but the strongest
authority against it.

Furthermore, this bill is in violation of the faith
of the Government, pledged in the act of January
28, 1847. The 19th section of that act declares,
"That, for the payment of the stock which may be
created under the provisions of this act, the sales
of the public lands are hereby pledged; and it
is hereby made the duty of the Secretary of the
Treasury to use and apply all moneys which may
be received into the treasury for the sales of the
public lands after the first day of January, 1848.
In my judgment, you cannot, by tributes to humanity,
make any adequate compensation for the wrong
you would inflict by removing the sources of power
and political action from those who are to be there-
by affected. If the time shall ever arrive when,
for an object appealing however strongly to our
sympathies, the dignity of the States shall bow to
the dictation of Congress, by conforming their
legislation thereto, when the power, and majesty,
and honor of those who created shall become sub-
ordinate to the thing of their creation, I but feebly
utter my apprehensions when I express my firm
conviction that we shall see "the beginning of the
end."

I have been unable to discover any distinction,
on constitutional grounds, or grounds of expedi-
ency, between an appropriation of \$10,000,000
directly from the money in the treasury, for the
object contemplated, and the appropriation of
lands presented for my sanction. And yet, I
cannot doubt that, if the bill proposed ten millions
of dollars from the treasury of the United States
for the support of indigent insane in the several
States, the constitutional question involved in the
act would have attracted forcibly the attention of
Congress.

I respectfully submit that, in a constitutional
point of view, it is wholly immaterial whether the
appropriation be in money or in land.

The public domain is the common property of
the Union just as much as the surplus proceeds of
that, and of duties on imports remaining unex-
pended in the treasury. As such it has been
pledged, is now pledged, and may need to be so
pledged again for public indebtedness.
As property, it is distinguished from actual mo-

ney chiefly in this respect: that its profitable
management sometimes requires that portions of
it be appropriated to local objects, in the States
wherein it may happen to lie, as would be done
by any prudent proprietor to enhance the sale-
value of his private domain. All such grants of
land are, in fact, a disposal of it for value received;
but they afford no precedent or constitutional
reason for giving away the public lands. Still
less do they give sanction to appropriations for
objects which have not been intrusted to the federal
government and therefore belong exclusively to
the States.

To assume that the public lands are applicable
to ordinary State objects, whether of public struc-
tures, police, charity, or expenses of State ad-
ministration, would be to disregard, to the amount
of the value of the public lands, all the limitations
of the constitution, and confound, to that extent,
all distinctions between the rights and powers of
the States, and those of the United States; for, if
the public lands may be applied to the support of
the poor, whether sane or insane, if the disposal
of them and their proceeds be not subject to the
ordinary limitations of the constitution, then Con-
gress possesses unqualified power to provide for
expenditures in the States by means of the public
lands, even to the degree of defraying the salaries
of governors, judges, and all other expenses of
the government, and internal administration within
the several States. The conclusion from the gen-
eral survey of the whole subject is, to my mind,
irresistible, and closes the question, both of right
and of expediency, so far as regards the principle
of the appropriation proposed in this bill. Would
not the admission of such a power in Congress to
dispose of the public domain work the practical
abrogation of some of the most important provi-
sions of the constitution? If the systematic reser-
vation of a definite portion of the public lands (the
sixteenth section) in the States, for the purpose
of education and occasional grants for similar
purposes be cited as contradicting these conclu-
sions, the answer as it appears to me, is obvious
and satisfactory. Such reservations and grants,
besides being a part of the conditions on which
the proprietary right of the United States is main-
tained, along with the eminent domain of a particu-
lar State, and by which the public land remains
free from taxation in the State in which it lies,
and as long as it remains the property of the
United States, are the acts of a mere land owner,
disposing of a small share of his property in a way
to augment the value of the residue, and in this
mode to encourage the early occupation of it by
the industrious and intelligent pioneer.

The great example of apparent donation of
lands to the States, likely to be relied upon as
sustaining the principles of this bill, is the relinqu-
ishment of swamp lands to the States in which
they are situated; but this, also, like other grants
already referred to, was based expressly upon
grounds clearly distinguishable in principle from
any which can be assumed for the bill herewith
returned, viz: upon the interest and duty of the
proprietor. They were charged, and not without
reason, to be a nuisance to the inhabitants of the
surrounding country. The measure was predi-
cated, not only upon the ground of the disease
inflicted upon the people of the States which the
United States could not justly, as a just and
honest proprietor, but also upon an express limita-
tion of the application of the proceeds, in the first
instance, to purposes of levees and drains, thus
protecting the health of the inhabitants, and, at
the same time, enhancing the value of the remain-
ing lands belonging to the general government.
It is not to be denied that Congress, while admin-
istering the public lands as a proprietor, within
the principle distinctly announced in my annual
message, may sometimes have failed to distinguish
accurately between objects which are and which
are not within its constitutional powers.

After the most careful examination, I find but
two examples in the acts of Congress which fur-
nish any precedent for the present bill, and those
examples will, in my opinion, serve rather as a
warning than as an inducement to tread in the
same path.

The first is the act of March 3d, 1819, grant-
ing a township of land to the Connecticut asylum
for the education of the deaf and dumb.
The second, that of April 5th, 1826, making a
similar grant of land to the Kentucky asylum for
teaching the deaf and dumb.

The first more than thirty years after the adop-
tion of the constitution, and the second more than
a quarter of a century ago.

These acts were unimportant as to the amount
appropriated, and so far as I can ascertain, were
passed on two grounds: first, that the object was
a charitable one; and, secondly, that it was na-
tional. To say that it was a charitable object, is
only to say that it was an object of expenditure
proper for the competent authority; but it no
more tended to show that it was a proper object
of expenditure by the United States than is any
other purely local object, appealing to the best
sympathies of the human heart in any of the
States. And the suggestion that a school for the
mental culture of the deaf and dumb in Connecti-
cut or Kentucky, is a national object only shows
how loosely this expression has been used when
the purpose was to procure appropriations by
Congress. It is not perceived how a school of
this character is otherwise national than is any
establishment of religious or moral instruction.

All the pursuits of industry, everything which
promotes the material or intellectual well-being
of the race, every ear of corn or boll of cotton
which grows, is national in the same sense; for
each one of these things goes to swell the aggre-
gate of national prosperity and happiness of the
United States; but it confounds all meaning of
language to say that these things are "national,"
as equivalent to "federal," so as to come within
any of the classes of appropriation for which
Congress is authorized by the Constitution to
legislate.

It is a marked point in the history of the con-
stitution that when it was proposed to empower
Congress to establish a university, the proposition
was confined to the district intended for the future
seat of government of the United States, and that
even that proposed clause was omitted in consid-
eration of the exclusive powers conferred on
Congress to legislate for that district. Could a
more decisive indication of the true construction
and the spirit of the constitution in regard to all
matters of this nature have been given? It
proves that such objects were considered by the

convention as appertaining to local legislation
only, that they were not comprehended, either
expressly or by implication, in the grant of gen-
eral power to Congress, and that, consequently,
they remained with the several States.

The general result at which I have arrived is
the necessary consequence of those views of the
relative rights, powers and duties of States and
of the federal government which I have long en-
tertained, and often expressed, and in reference
to which my convictions do but increase in force
with time and experience.

I have thus discharged the unwelcome duty of
fully stating my objections to this bill, with which
I cheerfully submit the whole subject to the wis-
dom of Congress.

FRANKLIN PIERCE.

WASHINGTON, May 3, 1854.

From the Richmond Enquirer.

The Veto Message.

Without hesitation or delay, the President has
put the executive veto on the Lunatic Land Bill.
There was never any cause of apprehension in re-
gard to the course of the Administration on this
and kindred measures. As a disciple of the school
of Jefferson and Jackson, Mr. Pierce has been con-
sistently opposed to every scheme for diverting
the public lands from their legitimate use, no matter
whether the appropriation be for the succor of lunatics,
the benefit of individuals of sound mind
but improvident habits, or the aggrandizement of
grasping corporations. But, even if such were
not the inclination of the Administration, the plat-
form of principle on which they stand, strictly and
emphatically forbids any secularization of the
public lands to uses not authorized by the constitu-
tion. The Baltimore Convention put its veto in
advance upon every measure for the distribution
of the public lands, which contemplates any object
besides the payment of the national debt and the
equal benefit of the several States.

The veto of the Lunatic Bill is a memorable step
in the progress of the Democratic party. The
alarming increase of Federal power and the gradual
oblivion of State right and strict construction
principles, furnished a controlling motive to the
nomination of Mr. Pierce. We wanted a man of
right principle and of genuine courage, to arrest
the tendency to federal corruption and aggrandize-
ment, and to bring back the Government to the
legitimate sphere of its powers and its duties. In
the statesman of New Hampshire the Democracy
found the man for their purpose. The event justifies
their choice. President Pierce has availed
himself of the first opportunity to testify his devo-
tion to the strict-construction creed, and to inflict
a staggering blow on the corrupt monster of
Federalism. In the veto of the Lunatic Bill, the
country has a pledge of the future policy of his
Administration. Neither timid nor reserved in
justifying his conduct, he lays down principles
which comprehend all similar measures. The
death warrant of the Homestead is signed in ad-
vance, and the thousand other schemes for the pil-
lage of the public lands are laid prostrate at one
blow. We cherish the hope that Congress will
not disregard the hint, nor persist in its piratical
forays on the public domain. Perhaps, however,
it may serve the purpose of demagoguism to press
these various schemes through Congress, with the
positive assurance in advance that they will meet
the untimely fate of the Lunatic Bill.

The most skillful pilot is embarrassed by the
shoals, narrows and sudden tacks of creek-naviga-
tion; once upon the broad ocean and the ship
springs forward in its career with an assurance of
safety. The administration of Mr. Pierce has been
embarrassed by a multitude of pretty annoyances
and difficulties, which were as inevitable as they
were difficult to manage. The distribution of the
patronage among an army of expectants awakened
some jealousies and provoked some resentment.

The course of the Administration was obstructed
by the clamors of the disappointed and the oppo-
sition of the factious, and for a time confusion and
delay subjected the President to suspicion and re-
proach. These difficulties have been surmounted,
and the Administration may now pursue their
course, free from the obstruction which beset their
early path. They may rally the Democratic party
on a common ground, by an appeal which the
Democracy can understand and to which they will
respond. The veto of the Lunatic Bill enunciates
a principle which the Democratic party will ap-
prove and support, and in battling for it they will
lose the recollection of their discreditable leads.